Beginning of

Predestination and incarnation

This title was preceded by

The Jesus of history reinterpreted for today

A critical evaluation of the contributions of Professor Benjamin W. Bacon to the interpretation of the fourth gospel

And is continued by

The social and religious origins of the Negro Church

The contribution of the new physics to religious thought

PREDESTINATION AND INCARNATION

by

Fred S. Stripp, Jr.

B.A. University of California, 1932

M.A. Pacific School of Religion, 1934

THESIS

Submitted in the department of Philosophy in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity in the Pacific School of Religion.

PREDESTINATION AND INDEMNATION

by

Fred S. Stripp, Jr.
B.A. University of California, 1952
M.A. Pacific School of Religion, 1954

THESIS

Submitted in the department of Philosophy
in partial fulfillment of requirements for
the degree of Bachelor of Divinity in the
Pacific School of Religion.

DEDICATION

TO THE FACULTY OF THE PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION, BERKELEY, WHO PROVE THE MIRACLE OF THE RESURRECTION IN THEIR DAILY LIVES, FOR IN EACH OF THEM IS LIVING TRIUMPHANTLY THE ETERNAL CHRIST.

DEDICATION

TO THE FACULTY OF THE PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION, BERKELEY, WHO PROVE THE MIRACLE OF THE RESURRECTION IN THEIR DAILY LIVES, FOR IN EACH OF THEM IS LIVING TRIUMPHANTLY THE ETERNAL CHRIST.

OUTLINE AND CONTENTS

OUTLINE AND CONTENTS

Since this thesis is not prepared as a target for the arrows of the atheist, I do not propose to defend the statement that "The men of the planet Earth are children of God." I am presuming that there is a Creator and that many of the individual members in the large family of humanity own this Creator as a common parent. Nor does this paper seek to launch another attack against the postulated theory that the individual known to the world as Jesus Christ never really lived. I am again presuming that this individual did live as an historical character in the large family of humanity. As a member of the Hebrew branch of the family of humanity, he would own the Creator as a common parent with the rest of his brother men.

We are considering the question, "If divinity is attributed to Jesus-Christ, does that deny the divinity of man?". Under that larger question we take cognizance of the sub-head interrogation, "Was this son the favorite son of God?". That is the question we desire to consider, not whether God is, whether we are God's children, or whether Jesus-Christ ever really lived.

Students of population trends and developments will tell us that dependable statistics do not go very far into the past, chronogically speaking. They could tell us, however, that the number of individuals who have ever inhabited this globe is a staggering figure. Out of this bewildering mass of humanity does Jesus-Christ stand out as the favorite son?

Students of anthropogeny as they present their findings

Since this thesis is not presented as a target for the arrows of the atheist, I do not propose to defend the statement that "The men of the planet Earth are children of God." I am presuming that there is a Creator and that many of the individual members in the large family of humanity own this Creator as a common parent. Nor does this paper seek to launch another attack against the postulated theory that the individual known to the world as Jesus Christ never really lived. I am again presuming that this individual did live as an historical character in the large family of humanity. As a member of the Hebrew branch of the family of humanity, he would own the Creator as a common parent with the rest of his brother men.

We are considering the question, "If divinity is attributed to Jesus-Christ, does that deny the divinity of man?". Under that larger question we take cognizance of the sub-head interrogation, "Was this son the favorite son of God?". That is the question we desire to consider, not whether God is, whether we are God's children, or whether Jesus-Christ ever really lived.

Students of population trends and developments will tell us that dependable statistics do not go very far into the past, chronologically speaking. They could tell us, however, that the number of individuals who have ever inhabited this globe is a staggering figure. Out of this bewildering mass of humanity does Jesus-Christ stand out as the favorite son?

Students of anthropology as they present their findings

about the origin and development of man can point a long, long way into the past to man's early beginnings. H.G. Wells has somewhere said that if the history of man could be represented in a five hundred page book, the known historical period would take up only the last page, and the Christian era would be represented in a very short paragraph at the bottom of that page. To an impartial observer of the history of God's children, there might well be a question as to why, if Jesus-Christ is the favorite son of God, he comes into the book of man's history at the bottom of page five hundred. Why has it been deemed wise to deprive so many children of the example of the favorite son?

Students of parent psychology in their recommendations to fathers who have more than one child are continually advising in the newspapers, periodicals, and from the lecture platforms that all the children receive an equal portion of father's love, and that there be no favorite child. Common sense and intuitive justice tell us that. The best father is the one who has an equal love for each of his five children. The father who has a favored son generally hurts himself, the other members of his family, and the favorite son. This is so commonly agreed that I hardly feel compelled to bring authorities to my support. The obvious inference to be drawn from the favorite son weakness in a human father is a magnified weakness in a divine father who has a favorite son. If Jesus-Christ was the favorite son of God, then we have a favoritism manifest in the character of God. Might

we not safely ask whether God ever had a favoritism for any of his children, let alone a favorite son in Jesus-Christ?

May I support a contention of mine that Jesus-Christ was conscious of a unity of will with God the Father which invested him with resources and responsibilities infinitely larger than any enjoyed by the most Godlike of our race, and yet he was not a favorite son of God.

Before the Civil War in America, Horace Bushnell's little booklet taken from his treatise, "Nature and the Supernatural", was printed with the title, "The Character of Jesus, Forbidding His Possible Classification with Men". In a recapitulation the author says: "He is a Lamb in innocence, a God in dignity; revealing an impenitent but faultless piety, such as no mortal ever attempted, such as, to the highest of mortals is inherently impossible". [1]

Although this statement is from a book entered in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York in the year 1860, it is enough in evidence today to make young people say that such a character cannot serve as an example to them, for by his very nature he cannot be followed. [2] The discouraging term in Bushnell's quotation and many in agreement with him today is the term "inherently impossible". If it is "inherently impossible" for the highest mortals to show the "impenitent and faultless piety" that he revealed, then it must be even more out of the question for the average individual to do so. This Jesus-Christ must have been the

favorite son of God. He may be said to have been born with a gold spoon of deity already in his mouth. He did not earn it. Therefore we, who are not born with the deity heritage have no chance to earn it. The divinity of Jesus-Christ denies the divinity of man. Jesus-Christ is not an example to be followed. He is, rather, a divinity to be set on a pedestal and worshipped or envied.

To the mind of many in this day that is certainly not the real Jesus-Christ. It becomes our task to show that our criticism does not leave a less lovable, a less spiritual, a less divine personality, but, rather, one who is more lovable, spiritual, divine, and real.

The analytical mind examining the position that out of the great multitudes of individuals that have lived, Jesus was pre-ordained and pre-destined to be the favorite son of God, might venture to question the justice of God. Is it Godlike to have myriads of children and out of them all arbitrarily choose one as the favorite son?

The analytical mind examining the position that out of the great multitudes of individuals that have lived, Jesus was the only one to completely surrender self will to the will of God, and thereby come into a unique revealing relationship as a son of God, might venture to sanction the justice of God and appreciate the achievement of Jesus.

The analytical mind examining the position that the despotic hand of God decreed the time for divinity to be born into one individual in the course of the ages might

in the interests of scholarship question the providence of such a God. Why wait until that particular time? If divinity was to enter but once into human form, why not make it the first man that all might follow after with the worship of the divine one?

The analytical mind examining the position, on the other hand, that the ages had to wait for an individual to unite his will with God's will and the first to do that was Jesus, might in the passionless impartiality of scholarship respect the providence of God and revere that sort of divinity in Jesus-Christ.

The analytical mind examining the position that without merit shown or deeds performed, Jesus was automatically granted divinity as the favorite son of God, might in the spirit of inquiring skepticism question the parental judgment of God. Should the omnipotence of God be used arbitrarily or fairly?

The analytical mind examining the position that because of the way he lived Jesus achieved divinity, and achieved it in an unusual degree as a devoted and not a favored son of God, might in philosophical justice respect the achiever and the quality achieved.

We are now ready to see what some of the recent writers have to say that would lead us to reject the positions that (1) Jesus was pre-ordained and pre-destined to be the favorite son of God, (2) The hand of God despotically decreed divinity to be born into this one individual at this arbitrarily

appointed time, and (3) Without merit shown or deeds performed Jesus was automatically granted divinity as a favorite son. At the same time we shall seek support for the three views that (1) Jesus was the only one to surrender self will to the will of God completely, (2) Jesus was the first one to unite his will with God's will, and (3) Jesus, by his way of life, achieved divinity in an unusual degree as a devoted but not as a favored son of God.

S. Parkes Cadman in "The Christ of God" (1929) says: "In his personality Jesus offers us the manifestations of God, not by a series of impressive truths concerning Deity, but by the far more compelling instrumentality of His own actual being and character which originated in his total consciousness of oneness with the Father." [3] "The whole cosmic process is projected and sustained by the universal Father for bringing many sons into glory, of whom Jesus Himself is the prototype." [4] "In Him God imparts Himself to man in His self-realizing paternity and man surrenders himself to God in his self-realizing Sonship." [5]

O.W.S. McCall in "Cardinals of Faith" (1924) says: Explain it as we may, Jesus brought God nearer to men than they had ever known him before, so that religion has become a new thing; and the hope of the world, the joy of life, the power of the Divine Presence, all have risen to new and unexampled measures since Jesus came." [6]

George A. Gordon in "The Christ of Today" (1895) says: "Only the supreme person in time can give us the supreme

Person above time. We reach the living God only as we find him mediated by the sons of God, and the leader of all the sons of God must take his place at the heart of our faith and at the centre of our educational and religious endeavor." [7]

George T. Tolson in "The Renaissance of Jesus" (1929) ".....Jesus attained and maintained a unique relationship of love and trust of the heavenly Father. One of such clear spiritual insight could not have been guilty of expressing his unique relationship to the Father in such self-conscious ways as he is reported to have done by the Gospel writers who were doubtless reading back into Jesus' lifetime the devotion of the early church to him. They were doubtless right in characterizing Jesus as having and as being conscious of having a relationship to God which was distinctly unique..." [8]

W.S. Bruce in "Apologetics of Christianity Defensively Stated" says: "What more legitimate and wholesome than to think of Jesus, the uniquely good, as the very Son of God, absolutely one with God in mind, will, and spirit? Then we are assured that Jesus is a veritable revelation of the Father. The Son hath declared Him." [9]

Leo Tolstoi in "My Religion" says: "The doctrine of Jesus consisted in the elevation of the Son of man, that is, in the recognition on the part of man, that he, man, was the son of God. In his own individuality Jesus personified the man who has recognized the filial relation with God." [10]

John Wright Buckham in "Christ and the Eternal Order" says: "But if God was Father to Jesus Christ in an especial

Jesus above them. He found the living God only as he "lived mediation of the ways of God, and the lamps of all our ways of God must then lie close at the heart of our faith and the centers of our educational and religious endeavor."

George S. Albee in "The Consciousness of Jesus" (1908) "....Jesus evidence was manifestly a unique relationship of love and trust of the heavenly Father. One of such a consciousness [sic] [illegible] could not have been guilty of overstepping his and the relationship to the Father in such unlawful ways as he is reported to have done by the Jewish authorities who were doubtless [illegible] over in to Jesus' lifetime the consciousness of his very, month to ok.. Jesus were [illegible] in characteristic ways as having and as [illegible] having a relationship to God which was absolutely unique..."

W.S. Bruce in "Evolution of Christianity [illegible] stated" says: "Just more logicians and worldsense than [illegible] of Jesus, the ultimately good, as the very Son of God, absolutely one with God in mind, will, and society. [illegible] we are assured that Jesus is a veritable revelation of the Father. The Son is [illegible] Him."

Jos Colwell in "My Religion" says: "The consciousness [illegible] consecrated in the experience of the son of man, that is, in the consecration of the best of man, that is, man, the son of God. In him our individually lives consecrated [illegible] man who has recognized the filial relation with God."

Frank Mathew Jackson in "Belief and the Central Verse" says: "But if God was [illegible] to Jesus [illegible]

sense and manner, does not that make him somewhat less than a Father to us? Rather, it is through Jesus Christ that he is a perfect Father to us." [11]

These writers do not seem to rest on any theory of predestination, despotic decree, automatic divinity to a favorite son, but they do recognize a harmony of the will of Jesus-Christ and the will of God and they do speak of a unique filial relation between this one of the sons of God and the Father. Furthermore, they think of him as an active achiever not a passive recipient of his unique divinity. Cadman feels him compel us to see God by the power of character originating in unity with the Father. McCall sees him bring God nearer to men than ever before. Gordon finds this supreme person in time giving us the supreme Person above time. Tolson says he attained a unique relationship with God. Bruce agrees with scripture that he declared Him. Tolstoi considers that he personified the man recognizing the filial relation with God. And Buckham feels that through Jesus Christ God is the perfect Father to all of us.

These authorities do not feel that the divinity of Jesus Christ denies the divinity of man. On the contrary they feel that his divinity reveals and fulfils the divine sonship of God's other children. His is a unique relationship which was deserved and not decreed. He was not a favored son but rather the filial prototype for bringing many sons into glory, as Cadman has suggested.

As we conclude our discussion of the first sub-question

"Was this son the favorite son of God?", I think we have reason to lean rather definitely toward the impartiality and parental justice of the Father because we find Him revealed in this Son of sons by the compelling, attaining, declaring power of this uniquely related filial personality, Jesus-Christ. Not a favorite son, then, but rather one who gives us a unique revelation of the Father.

We turn now to a different question of his sonship, under the main question, "If divinity is attributed to Jesus-Christ, does that deny the divinity of man?". This question is the second sub-head, "Is he in a category above Buddha, Zoroaster, Mohammed?".

One of the few books the writer has read with which he can agree in entirety is O.W.S. McCall's "Cardinals of Faith". On the very first page is a comparison of the universe to a pyramid which I should like borrow, not to prove anything, but simply to credit the author with the inspiration for the second question we are considering. Dr. McCall is not trying to prove anything with relation to Christ. In fact, the chapter title is "God".

"The universe is a pyramid pointing to God. Near Cairo, the visitor to the pyramids sees them built in layers, and one of the pyramids still retains a little of the alabaster that once faced them all; crowning the apex, the alabaster still points to the sky. Is there not something like this in the impressive testimony of the universe to God? First, the mineral base, and upon it the vegetable, and then the animal, each layer narrowing in extent as the pyramid rises; and then the human, and higher still the supermen, prophets and geniuses and seers; above them, the few demigods, as Moses, Confucius, Zoroaster, Buddha, Mohammed; and last, nearest to heaven, the crown and glory of the whole, the alabaster apex, Christ." [12]

This metaphor has led me to ask the question, "Is Jesus-

Christ in a place above Buddha, Zoroaster, Mohammed?"

I feel very keenly the spirit which has prompted many moderns in the Christian group to speak in rational judgment and intellectual impartiality concerning these great representatives of other religions. We have more than enough bigotry and prejudiced partisanship in our Church History now, without pouring any more oil on the fires of controversy.

We might attack the problem by impressing into service the oft recruited visitor from Mars and let him choose between these personalities, ranking them according to their worth. But, of course, that would only result in our placing in his mouth our own words and making him a loan of our judgment, for his standards would very probably be so different from ours that he could not act as judge even if Martians have an urge to be accomodating.

We might attack the problem by supposing a gathering from these representative religions of four intelligent ancestors, one from each race, men who were born into the world before Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, and Mohammed, and yet direct race ancestors of the four. We might endow each of these four judges with a longevity which would take them through the centuries when these four great men lived and yet prevent them from studying the personality of any of them. Then we might assemble the biographies and teachings of all four with all the scholastic findings available and, without attaching names but only giving numbers from one to four to each, allow the sages to select the one they considered first and rank the four in

order. But it would be so difficult to prevent any influences from these four systems and personalities from reaching them that this would be invalidated as a method of judging. And for our own particular purpose we would again be using only our own imaginations in place of their findings.

The only method I can resolve upon, consistent with thesis writing, is to be impartial as I look upon all four religious teachers, to grant to each one as much as the intellect can rationally grant, to raise each one as high as he will go, and if Buddha comes out on top, then the answer to our question is in the negative. So with Zoroaster and Mohammed. If Jesus rises to the highest level, then the answer is in the affirmative.

If a fiat from heaven were suddenly to call upon all peoples under these great religions to unite in one religion, what would the contributions from each of the four be? Would there be four sons of God in equal rank, or one in a place above the other three? If the latter, which one?

Twenty-five centuries ago a young man in India beheld three sights which, common enough to others, changed his life. He saw a feeble, helpless, tottering old man; he saw a leper, hideous in his loathesomeness; he saw a funeral procession. Then he decided to find the solutions in life for infirmity, disease, and death. The result of his wandering searches was "enlightenment". He prepared all his inspired revelation as a religious philosophy. It was concerned with all of life's problems, not infirmity, disease,

order. But it would be [illegible] from these four [illegible] their rule would be [illegible] not [illegible] our own [illegible] we would [illegible] value [illegible] our [illegible] in [illegible] of their [illegible].

The only record I was considering, consisted of a [illegible] writing, to be [illegible] as I took down all four [illegible] recorded, to [illegible] in each one as much as the [illegible] [illegible], by [illegible] we [illegible] it [illegible] out of [illegible] to our [illegible] is in the [illegible]. [illegible] it [illegible] to the [illegible], [illegible] the [illegible] is the [illegible].

If a [illegible] were [illegible] in [illegible] under these [illegible] to [illegible] in [illegible], would [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] would [illegible] be [illegible] some of [illegible], or [illegible] place [illegible] the [illegible]? If the [illegible], which one?

Twenty-five [illegible] in [illegible], while three of this [illegible], [illegible] to [illegible]. [illegible] life. [illegible], [illegible], [illegible]: [illegible], [illegible] in his [illegible]; [illegible]. [illegible] he [illegible] the [illegible] in [illegible], [illegible], [illegible]. The [illegible]. He [illegible]. [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible] ibid.

and death exclusively.

Where Vedic ceremonials had become elaborate andexpensive, dry and forbidding, he offered a fervent and inspiring morality. Where asceticism had come to be regarded with veneration, he offered as a substitute for asceticism and sensualism alike, temperance, with a splendid personal example. Where the caste system had grown degrading, undemocratic, and obnoxiously exclusive, he proposed the ennobling, inclusive doctrine of brotherhood. For scriptural infallibility of the Vedas, he offered enlightened reason as the safe substitute. For speculation on insoluble questions, he offered a practical course in ethical self-discipline. He gave out no positive information about Nirvana, but described it simply as that blessed state in which re-birth is forever impossible. So far as his religion was concerned, it was practically atheistic, for he recognized no supreme deity, but only the various gods of the Brahmanic pantheon. Clearly, the message of this great oriental was essentially ethical, practical, humanitarian. By emphasis on character rather than creed, on temperance as superior to asceticism and the safeguard against sensualism, by presenting the "Brotherhood of Man" as the ideal human relationship, by advocating democracy in religion as he said "My religion makes no distinction between high and low, rich and poor; it is like the sky; it has room for all and, like water, it washes all alike. To him in whom love dwells the whole world is but one family",--by all these things, Gotama, the Buddha, bequeathed to the race precepts and an example that

will be an inspiration for all peoples and for all time.[13]

Certainly this individual ranks high among the sons of men. We can hardly say, however, that he experienced a unique relationship with the Father, for he himself refused to declare Him.

When it comes to a consideration of Zoroaster, it must be admitted that scholarship has no easy task to judge this Persian teacher. His birthday has been guessed all the way from 6000 B.C. to 300 B.C.; testimonies conflict as to his birthplace; and neither year, month, nor day of his nativity is known. Less is known of him than any of the great moral leaders of the Orient. It is known that he recoiled from the conventionals of his day in religion who thought it right to pass half the day in begging food in order that the rest of the day might be spent under a shady tree in meditation. It is also known that he was the spiritual advocate for the righteous deity in a dualistic system where the two powers of light and darkness were in constant contention. He felt the call to champion Ahura Mazda and urged all men to ever strive valiantly against evil. Death was not to be feared, being a fact, but only not having lived well enough. Those who constantly contended against evil could meet death fearlessly. The weapons used by the soldiers of Ahura-Mazda are not swords, but ploughshares, not guns, but good thoughts and words and deeds. He prohibited fasting, self-torture, excessive grief, and anything else that would enervate the body or reduce the power of the will, for good soldiers of

will be an inspiration for all warriors for all time."

Certainly this incidental note rises above the usual [illegible] [illegible], we can hardly say, however, that he enunciated a unique Christian ethic for war, for he himself [illegible] [illegible] Him.

When it comes to a consideration of Constance, it must be understood that scholarship has no easy task to judge this peculiar character. His biography has been praised all the way from 400 A.D. to our day; testimonies conflict as to his birthplace; and neither year, month, nor day of his death is known. Less is known of him than any of the other great leaders of the Church. It is known that he recalled from the conventionalism of his day in religion the "monastic [illegible]" night to near half the day in service of God in order that the rest of the day might be spent under a shady tree in contemplation. It is also known that he was the spiritual counsellor for the [illegible] letter in a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] forces of light and darkness were in constant conflict. He felt the call to asceticism [illegible] about and [illegible] to serve [illegible] actively against evil. There was not to be formed, using a fact, but only for having lived well [illegible] those who scrupulously proceeds against evil could most useful fearlessly. The weapons used by the soldiers of Christ are not swords, but [illegible], not guns. But [illegible] and words and deeds. He prescribed fasting, self-abnegation, and anything else that would [illegible] the body or reduce the power of the flesh, for such [illegible]

the righteous deity must always be in trim.

Where Gotama, the Buddha sought to overcome existence in order that suffering, sorrow, and re-birth may be ended, Zoroaster sought to overcome evil in order that existence might be glorified and transfigured.

As a great moral leader Zoroaster had a Kingdom of the Good here on earth. The Kingdom was warring on the Kingdom of Evil. Human beings were given free will to choose between the two on earth and their choice determined their salvation or damnation. His mission on earth was to reveal the laws and wishes of Ahura-Mazda and help people choose his Kingdom on earth that they might share with him the ultimate victory of good over evil. Each human soul was to learn from him that God's will is the triumph of good and that each individual should act as a cooperator with Him in the gigantic, age-long task of world redemption. [14]

Zoroaster deserves high rank among the sons of men. He felt the call of a prophet and the divine sense of instrumentality in revelation. His religion was disqualified, however, from becoming a universal religion, because of an intensely local, elaborate, detailed scheme of ritual, together with exacting demands on the worshippers, and an involved, complicated system of theology.

"Great Religious Teachers of the East" by Alfred W. Martin sets forth the author's generous hope in the chapter on Mohammed that the maligned and misunderstood prophet should have a fairer treatment from scholars of the present

and future. Resolved to grant an open mind to the account to follow, I read with interest what I knew to be a sympathetic account of this famous religious leader. I desired to be influenced by justice and truth in favor of the revered leader. In many instances this desire was fulfilled. I admired the young man who gave up a profitable position because his conscience would not tolerate certain superstitious practices connected with it. The youth who refused to name his own price at the request of his wealthy uncle to desist from his religious radicalism deserves high commendation. The humility of the man who asked that no praise be given him, for he, too, might err and need forgiveness of sin, --this, also, must be respected.

According to this teacher "submission" expresses in a single word the supreme duty of the individual to God. "Submission" as inculcated by Mohammed is not merely a spiritual attitude of believers toward Allah, however, but includes four distinct duties: to abjure idolatry, to extend the heavenly Sultan's dominion on earth by new converts, using force if necessary, to obey the precepts of Allah, and to be loyal to the five pillars of fidelity, creed, prayer, almsgiving, fasting, pilgrimage.

The gospel of submission may be said to have aptly fitted the uncivilized tribes under Mohammed's influence. To his lasting credit it may be said that one of religious history's notable achievements was the transfer of his transfiguring

[illegible] Future. Resolved to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] to follow, I read with interest [illegible] I [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] account of this [illegible] [illegible] leader. I [illegible] to be [illegible] by justice and truth in favor of the governing [illegible]. [illegible] many [illegible] this [illegible] was fulfilled. I [illegible] the [illegible] men who [illegible] a profitable position because his [illegible] would not tolerate certain [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] with it. The youth was ordered to [illegible] his own [illegible] the treatment of his [illegible] [illegible] to [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] associated with [illegible]. The [illegible] the [illegible] who [illegible] that [illegible] be [illegible] him, for he, too, [illegible] and need forgiveness of sin, --this, also, must be [illegible].

According to this [illegible] "submission" expresses in a single word the supreme duty of the individual to God. "Submission" as inculcated by Mohammed is not merely a spiritual [illegible] of believers towards Allah, however, but implies four [illegible] duties: to abjure idolatry, to [illegible] the [illegible] Islam's dominion on earth by [illegible] converts, [illegible] force if necessary, to obey the ordinances of Islam, and to be loyal to the five pillars of [illegible], creed, [illegible], almsgiving, fasting, pilgrimage.

The gospel of submission may be said to have early [illegible] the multiplied tribes under Mohammed's influence. To his [illegible] it may be said that one of religious history's [illegible] [illegible] was the [illegible] of his [illegible].

ideas into the existing social system of Arabia. In the fulfilment of that civilizing work, Mohammed rendered invaluable service, not only to Arabia, but also to the entire world.[15]

No matter how we look at the picture of this man, however, it appears to be rather strange. He seems to have been eccentric. He married a woman fifteen years older than himself. He was subject to attacks from a nervous disorder. And he ranked Adam, Noah, and Abraham with Moses and Jesus as the prophets before him. And in addition to eccentricity, scholarship is inclined to question a moral and religious leader who leads military crusades to spread his cult. With all his fine qualities and splendid achievements, there seems to be a strong reason in these shortcomings for ranking mohammed at least a little lower than Gotama and Zoroaster.

When we come to an unemotional treatment of the fourth leader in this great religious quartet of the East, we must admit at the outset that we have nothing that he himself wrote, that most of the records we do have were written some years after his death, that the birthday we celebrate for him is only a guess on the part of early missionaries in the Roman Empire, that Bethlehem as the birthplace is only a theory on the part of the first and third gospel authors based upon Old Testament prophecy, and that little is known of his early years, nothing at all of eighteen years, and what little we know is all concentrated on the three years

of his ministry recorded in the gospels.

Just as Gotama, the Buddha, was born and died a Brahman and as out of his protests against the defects in Brahmanism Buddhism arose after his death, so Jesus, the Christ, was born and died a Jew and out of his protests against the defects in Judaism Christianity arose after his death. He protested against the externally formal character of contemporary Jewish ethics, against the mere conformity to and compliance with external standards of morality. He transcended Judaism with a morality of the spirit, a law of obedience to an internal standard which could not be measured by a mechanical set of laws.

Jesus had a loyalty to conviction that led him to crucifixion. He had a marked sympathy for men in an age of cruelty and tyranny. He dedicated his life to the special purpose of preparing the largest possible number of men and women to be members in the new Kingdom of Heaven, soon to appear on earth. He presented to humanity the idea that God was a Heavenly Father; Jesus felt a unique sonship relation to the Father himself which made it possible to teach the rest of God's children their filial tie with Deity. A Christian, at the founding of the faith, differed from the representatives of every other religion by his belief in the exceptional character of Jesus, who alone of all men was able, through his perfection, to fulfil the law of righteousness and thereby became the fitting instrument to bring about the reconciliation of man to God.[16]

of his military service in the service.

Just as Solomon, the Judge, was even and what a Thousand and as two of his concepts regarding the suffering in Ecclesiastes Daniel was after his death, so Jesus, the Lawyer, was born and lived a few and one of his profound sayings that dwelt in Judaism distinctly came after his death.

He protested against the strictly formal character of contemporary Jewish ethics, saying the more importing to the conscience with several degrees of morality. He recognized Judaism with a morality of the spirit, a law of obedience to an internal authority which not be an outer a moral set of laws.

Jesus had a loyalty to principles that law did not satisfy. He was a marked character for men in an age of actuality and dreaming. He demonstrated his life to, the essential purpose of the essential for humanity and life character of men and women to be members in the new kingdom of Heaven, soon to appear on earth. He recognized to humanity the love that had was a friendly feature; Jesus felt it and was strongly opposed to the Rabbinic Pharisaic which made it possible to treat the best of God's children as the filthy rich with pride.

Jesus, at the Pharisaic, at the fair, different from the representative of every other religion, his belief in the personal character of God, who alone of all men can with, through the perfection, to fulfill the law of christianity and freedom, because the Fathers Kingdom ? he all people in reconciliation of man to God.

Unlike Gotama, The Enlightened, who felt that declarations concerning a supreme deity were out of his sphere, Jesus, The Anointed, found that to be his sphere. He calls himself the "Son of God" and "Son of Man" and refers intimately to "My Father", and in these self-declarations asserts a special relation to God. We may all be sons of God, but he admits himself to be the son.

Unlike Zoroaster he had no involved and elaborate schemes of ritual, no exacting demands of a ceremonial nature impressed upon worshippers, and no complicated theology. Where Zoroaster thought very little of meditation, fasting, and prayer and emphasized the strenuous life of physical labor and spiritual warfare, and where Gotama thought contemplation to be one of the ways of salvation and had rather a pessimistic outlook on life contrasted with Zoroaster, Jesus lived the strenuous life and also retired from men for prayer, fasting, and meditation. He combined the good features in both, making a balance that the other two failed to present.

Unlike Mohammed he was not the military conqueror of new converts. In fact, he seems to have been to many a complete disappointment because he was not the expected military saviour.

Unlike Mohammed who felt himself to be a sinful man, liable to err as other men and needing forgiveness, Jesus was able to offer the unprecedented moral challenge "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" [18] He was confident of sinlessness. There are so many writers who believe that he lived a perfect

life that there is no more need to produce testimonies to the fact than there would be to support the statement that he was a Jew.

Because of his perfect manhood, because of his divinity manifest in the unique relationship of a filial nature to God, because he seems to have a balance in religion that combines the emphasis of Gotama and Zoroaster, because he does not have the human weakness confessed by Mohammed, I feel that with impartial reason and intellectual integrity we must place Jesus-Christ in a place above Buddha, Zoroaster, and Mohammed.

If a fiat from heaven were suddenly to call upon all peoples under these great religions to unite in one religion, the four could prepare a harmony of their scriptures that would make a very presentable sacred book.[20] They would find that the later literatures fulfilled rather than departed from the earlier ones.[21] They would appreciate the greatness and the influence for good shown in the lives of all the teachers. They might conceivably decide on a worship of the Supreme One and regard Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, and Mohammed as prophets and revealers of his laws and truths and ways of salvation. But after Time had had sufficient opportunity to remove prejudices and loyalties of long standing, one of these four would almost inevitably rise above the other three, for human judgment tends toward unity. If our attempt at a scholarly and unbiased presentation of the great four in this paper is at all suggestive, the one who would ascend to that

position of unique proximity to the Supreme One would be Jesus, "The Anointed".

So we return to the metaphor of the pyramid borrowed from Dr. McCall and as the universe points to God, we see the mineral base, the vegetable and animal layers, then the human, the supermen, higher still the few demigods, as Moses, Confucius, Zoroaster, Buddha, Mohammed; and last, nearest to heaven, the crown and glory of the whole, the alabaster apex, Christ.

This expresses in a picturesque way what we have sought to arrange in a scholarly way, the place above Buddha, Zoroaster, and Mohammed where Jesus-Christ in the light of modern knowledge and research rightfully belongs.

In summary, the divinity of Jesus-Christ fulfils rather than denies the divinity of man. He was not a favorite son of God, but one who recognized and lived the filial relationship in a unique way. He seems to belong in a place above Buddha, Zoroaster, and Mohammed largely on this account.

In the prologue to the Fourth Gospel we find the Logos Doctrine telling us of the incarnation of the Word or Christ. Verse fourteen of the prologue is its climax: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth".

Verse nine is very worthy of thought in the question we are to consider: "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man coming into the world". And verse twelve says: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God".

If the Logos "lighteth every man coming into the world", is not that an incarnation of divinity in every individual? Yet the Logos "was made flesh and dwelt among us", and we saw "glory as of the <u>only begotten son</u> of the Father". Does this not imply the lone visitation of divinity upon one son?

To those who received this Logos and believed on his name, "to them gave he the power to become the sons of God". And these were not born of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, "but of God". Does not this imply that through faith in this incarnate Logos in one son, other men become sons of God by a spiritual second birth or an incarnation?

Perhaps the three verses can be harmonized. Does this sound more acceptable? 1. God dwells incarnate in one son

In the prologue to the Fourth Gospel we find the Johannine doctrine reflected in the incarnation of the Word or Logos. Verse fourteen of the prologue is the climax: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth".

Verse nine is very worthy of comment in the question we are to consider: "That was the true light, which lightetH every man coming into the world". The verse reading reads: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God".

If the Logos "lightetH every man coming into the world", is not there an intuition of divinity in every individual? For the Logos "was made flesh and dwelt among us", and we saw "glory as of the only begotten son of the Father". Does it not imply the Logos vivification of divinity in man?

To those who received this Logos and believed on his name, "to them gave he the power to become the sons of God". Can these words not mean of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, "but of God". Does not this imply that there does dwell in this Logos-Word Jesus in the son, that man become sons of God by a mystical second birth of the Logos?

Perhaps the three verses can be harmonized. Verse nine sound more accurate if I. God dwells in man in the

in special degree. 2. There is a spark of God incarnate in every son. 3. Through faith in the one son in whom God dwells in special degree the other sons in whom there is a spark of God incarnate experience a spiritual birth when the spark of God incarnate in them is touched by the spirit of God incarnate in special degree in the one son.

This introductory philosophizing on the incarnation question is not meant for final acceptance without support, but intends to lead to a discussion of the related terms, incarnation, free will, and divinity.

Under the larger question, "Can the incarnation and free will be reconciled?", we have the sub-heads:

1. Can we think of divinity without the incarnation?
2. Is predestination implied in the incarnation?
3. Was Jesus-Christ predestined to his course, or did he blaze it?

Our first sub-head, Can we think of divinity without the incarnation?

The idea of divinity resident in human flesh is very common and widespread in the history of the race. "In Egypt, from the earliest days up to the time of the last Pharaohs, the king was regarded as an incarnation of the deity." [22] In Babylon, from the time of Sargon I, the founder of the empire, the kings were accounted emanations of the Godhead. Sargon's son, Naramsin, called himself 'God of Agade, lord of the orb of heaven'." [23] "When Alexander the Great had conquered the Persian and Egyptian Empires, he permitted himself

in special degree. 2. There is a sense of God [illegible] in every man. 3. Christian faith is the one way in which the world in special degree has come to know there is a source of and inspiration in the universe [illegible] that the sum of and inspiration in them is [illegible] by the ideals of the inspiration special degree in the one man.

This introductory [illegible] on the incarnation [illegible] sion is not meant for final conference without [illegible] [illegible] to lead to a discussion of the [illegible] [illegible] incarnation, free will, and divinity.

Under the lecture question, "Can the incarnation and free will be reconciled", we have the sub-topics:

1. Can we think of divinity without the incarnation?
2. Is incarnation implied in the incarnation?
3. The Jesus-Christ' [illegible] [illegible], or did [illegible] [illegible]

Our first sub-head, Can we think of divinity without incarnation?

The idea of divinity without is known [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] in the history of the race. "In [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the Jesus Christ [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in incarnation of the [illegible]." In Babylon, from the time of Sargon I, the founder of the [illegible], the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] son, Hammurabi, called himself "God of [illegible], lord of [illegible] of [illegible]." "Even Alexander the Great had [illegible] [illegible] the Greeks and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], by [illegible] [illegible]

to be styled the son of the Egyptian god, Ammon-Ra." [24] The East and West in the Roman Empire have an interesting difference with regard to the ruler's divinity. In the East each living emperor was a real incarnation of the deity. In the West, after the death of the emperor, if he was considered worthy by the Senate, he was elevated to divinity because of his own personal merit. [25] In this latter case it would seem that they thought of divinity without the incarnation, for divinity was ascribed to the emperor after death and incarnation is the taking on of the human body by the spirit of deity or divinity. According to Western Rome an emperor was divinity incarnate because of his high office.

Pythagoras was regarded by his disciples as an incarnation of Apollo. [26] Plato, Scipio Africanus, and Augustus were also regarded as incarnations of Apollo. Alexander the Great and Apollonius of Tyana were accounted to be incarnations of Zeus. [27] Buddha's story is very like that of Christ's as the virgin birth, gifts and homage to the new child, and remarkable child precocity. [28]

It is hardly unprejudiced scholarship to condemn all of these other incarnation stories and theories to the scrapheap and cling with stubborn assurance to the legitimacy of our own incarnation doctrine, unless, of course, logic points that way.

Most of the kings, emperors, and supermen received the attribute of divinity from their fellows because they

were supermen. A rather simple method of explaining their unusual powers was to assume that deity was incarnate in them. When we come to the Buddha, however, the case is not quite the same, because of the very close comparisons all along between him and the Christ. We did discover, however, in our comparison between Gotama, the Buddha and Jesus, the Christ that the former felt no unique relationship to the the Supreme One while the latter acknowledged a very special filial consciousness toward the Father. It is also interesting to note that Alexander the Great probably did not feel the sense of incarnate divinity until his conquered captives attributed it to him. Perhaps the flattery of the tribute and his own probably self-satisfaction led him to permit himself to be called an incarnation. But this was not the case with Jesus. He receives Peter's declaration "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God" with the following answer: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." [29] He recognized the incarnation himself; others recognized it in him; [30] and when Peter declared it, he said that God had revealed it to him and not flesh and blood. Thus, in addition to the declarations of men about the incarnation, Jesus himself acknowledged it and backed up the acknowledgement with a perfect life. And he added to that the statement that it was God's revelation to Peter which made him recognize divinity incarnate.

Either divinity is achieved and comes at some period in

life when achievement reaches the degree of divinity, or it is born into an individual and flourishes or languishes according to the effect upon it of free will, surrender, God-consciousness. If divinity is achieved, then divinity does not take on human form but rather human form takes on divinity. Then it would be plausible to think of divinity without the incarnation. But is it not more widely agreed that divinity is a quality born into every man?

Pfleiderer finds in Augustine's discussion of the sacraments "the truth of the continuous incarnation of God in the hearts of good men". [31]

McCall believes that "Every man is in some real sense an incarnation of God." He goes on to ask the question, "Is this a dream? Then it is also a dream that God can ever mean much to us, for if you insist upon separating him from this intimate indwelling, you also separate us from knowing anything about him.....It is not without import that the ancients believed that the gods sometimes took human shape; we may yet come to see that God continually takes human shape. This is not to say that all that is human is God and that therefore we are God. But it is to say that God, who is infinitely greater than man, yet actually dwells in us, and more and more as we show him hospitality." [32]

Tolson quotes Schleiermacher as saying "The conception of God as one single being outside of the world and behind the world is not the beginning and the end of religion..... The true nature of religion is neither this idea nor any

other, but the immediate consciousness of the Deity as he is found in ourselves and in the world". He goes on to say for himself "All men are divine because more or less conscious of their relation to God, but Jesus was controlled by this consciousness".[33]

George A. Gordon in his volume of sermons, "Through Man to God", says in the conclusion of one sermon, "The Humanity of God": "The humanity of God is given in the humanity of man; it is given supremely in the humanity of Jesus. We ascend to God through man and his sovereign leader; through man and his sovereign leader we receive God. This is our faith."[34]

Tolstoi says: "The doctrine of Jesus consisted in the elevation of the Son of man, that is, in the recognition on the part of man, that he, man, was the son of God".[35]

Buckham sums up our thought on this question with the following: "Not a man who ever lived but has felt that he could have reached a higher manhood, but not a man but has felt that had he done his utmost he could not have been a perfect man. Perfection is outside the range of human possibility, --in the present life at any rate.....Of men of imperfect, incomplete humanity, nobly striving after perfection, the world has had many, and richly have they helped their fellows; but not one of them could redeem humanity because not one was wholly, perfectly human. Paradox though it seem, perfect humanity is necessarily superhuman, supernatural, divine. If the best that is in us all is divine, He in whom

the best rules absolutely is divine indeed. Would we have a Christ who is wholly, richly, perfectly human, we needs must have an incarnation." [36]

So it becomes our guided conclusion that we cannot think of divinity without the incarnation. Divinity is not achieved, but rather "lighteth every man coming into the world", and in him it "became flesh and dwelt among us".

The answer to the first sub-head in the second division of the thesis, "Can we think of divinity without the incarnation?", is to be given in the negative for the following reasons:

1. Those whom we found in history had had divinity ascribed to them were kings, conquerors, emperors, and philosophers. Their contemporaries explained their unusual powers by ascribing divinity to them or by supposing divinity to be incarnate in them. Probably no modern scholar would be willing to admit that the Pharaohs, Sargon, Naramsin, Alexander the Great, Scipio Africanus, Augustus, or Apollonius of Tyana were incarnations of divinity. Rather the tendency would be for religious scholars to look upon these men as barriers to the coming of Godliness among men.

2. Pythagoras and Plato were said to be incarnations of Apollo. Apollo is quite generally acknowledged to be a non-existing mythological character. Pythagoras and Plato were not spoilers of men as the list of potentates and conquerors given above represent. Neither would they be admitted, I think, as divine by modern thinkers simply

because of unusual scholarship and philosophy.

3. Gotama, the Buddha, lived so unusual a life that multitudes of his followers believe him to be an incarnation of divinity. This belief would not change the answer of our question, however, unless it were to be changed to another belief, namely, that Gotama, the Buddha, earned divinity. The close parallel of this character to the character of Jesus-Christ has already been referred to, and the virgin emphasezes the incarnation.

4. Pfleiderer, McCall, Schleiermacher, Tolson, Gordon, Tolstoi, and Buckham have indicated where we have quoted from them that divinity is explainable only by the incarnation.

The second sub-head in our second division of the thesis reads: "Is predestination implied in the incarnation doctrine?".

When the word became flesh and lived among men, could the one in whom divinity was incarnate live an other than perfect life? Is not the very nature of divinity the perfect humanity? When divinity becomes incarnate in human form, is there not a course of perfection predestined?

We have already quoted Pfleiderer as finding in Augustine's discussion of the sacraments "the truth of the continual incarnation of God in the hearts of good men". But note that the men are spoken of as "good men", not as perfect men.

We have quoted McCall as believing that "Every man is in some real sense an incarnation of God." This does not show perfection, but rather that God dwells more and more in man as man shows him hospitality. Thus do we see not perfection in incarnation but improvement.

We have seen that Tolson feels "All men are divine because more or less conscious of their relation to God". This would imply that as men became more and more conscious of their relation to God, they would show the improvement spoken of in the above paragraph.

We have quoted Buckham as saying "not a man but has felt that had he done his utmost he could not have been a perfect man". This allows for improvement, but not for perfection for the incarnations of God in Pfleiderer's, McCall's, and Tolson's quotations.

Perfection is not claimed for man by himself. "All have

sinned and come short of the glory of God" is a human universal and would be agreed upon so entirely as to require no quoted examples. Thus, if there is a spark of divinity in every man, incarnation does not imply predestined perfection, for men do not claim perfection. They do, however, claim the spark of divinity. Augustine: "the continuous incarnation of God in the hearts of good men." McCall: "every man is in some real sense an incarnation of God." Schleiermacher: "the immediate consciousness of the Deity as he is found in ourselves." Tolson: "all men are divine because more or less conscious of their relation to God."

There must by penetrating reason be something of the divine in man to allow him to have any conception of God. The spark of divinity in man is the point of connection between between man and The Deity. Unless every man is in a measure an incarnation of God, then God is separated from the intimacy of indwelling immanence, and man is separated from knowing anything about Him. The Deity becomes an unrelated abstraction. By claiming that man is in no real sense an incarnation, man is denied, but God also is belittled, for the very perfections which we recognize to be divine in Him are in His relationships to his creatures. We have discarded a large part of the creation story so far as accuracy is concerned, but we can recognize the spiritual implications behind the Genesis declaration that God created man in his own image. For if we believe in a creator at all, certainly we know that He must have put something of Himself

into the creature by the very nature of the process. When a sculptor takes a shapeless mass of stone and from it carves a Hermes or a Venus, the mass of stone becomes infused with his idea and from him takes on identity and human meaning. So when the divine sculptor takes the human clay and from it shapes a Lincoln, a Paul, an ordinary Tom Jones, or a Mary Smith, the clay becomes infused with His idea and from Him takes on identity and divine meaning. Something of the human sculptor gives human meaning to the statue. Something of the divine sculptor gives divine meaning to the human clay.

Is it more logical to assume that because we cannot by chemical analysis or scientific study in the laboratory discover the element of divinity that there is no element of divinity? Or is it more logical to assume that an omniscient and omnipotent creator would certainly place in the creatures of his creation enough of the element of divinity to make spiritual relationship possible? Is not the denial of divinity incarnate in man, the denial of the adequate provision of the creator for his creation?

Thus, if the reader is led to agree that divinity is incarnate in man in certain degree, then perfection is not predestined in incarnation.

Predestination does not necessarily imply perfection, however, and the old predestinarian ideas sought to account for everything by the theory of predestination. Every move one made was predestined. If one sought to disprove predestination in a matter where choice was involved, the

choice that was made was said to be the predestined choice. Thus no one could get around this theory because it was made to shape and fit every act and word and deed which occurred in time. Such a theory could explain things no better than the theory of free will, which would account for every choice made, every act and word and deed which occurred in time by the action of human free will. This theory, too, could be made to fit everything, but it did seem more acceptable to experience a human free will which could be felt than to imagine a force of predestination which could not be felt. It was also more readily understandable for human free will to take one along the general failing, faltering, mistaken course of life, while it would be difficult to understand a divine will which took man along this same course and did not bring him to human development and something pointing toward perfection. In this way predestination has come to be, as the setting of one's course by God from start to finish, a very unsatisfactory explanation of human destiny. Men have reasoned that where there were several choices open to them, they could adopt any one of these choices by their own free will, and if the choice they made was predestined, it did not make itself felt in their wills, and they, therefore felt predestination to be a rather feeble doctrine.

Unless, then, predestination implies a trend toward perfection because of the incarnation of divinity, there is very little reason to suggest that it is a part of life at all, else God is only amusing Himself by sending some humans

the right way and others the wrong way.

When man has the incarnation of divinity, is his course predestined? Or does he possess also human free will, which does the directing of his course? If the former, then the course must be predestined in the way of life most suitable to one with the incarnation of divinity. Surely our human experience and common sense tells us at once that men are not following such a course in the main. But if we accept the latter alternative, then when free will answers to the spark of divinity incarnate, the course is most suitable to one with the incarnation of divinity. When free will does not answer to the spark of divinity incarnate, the course is not most suitable to one with the incarnation of divinity.

To the reader's logical mind, to the reader's honest mind, to the reader's open mind, is not free will the answer rather than predestination? We cannot rely on the spark of divinity incarnate to shape our course along the road to perfection. Predestination is not implied in the incarnation doctrine.

In summary on the second sub-head in our second division of the thesis, "Is predestination implied in the incarnation doctrine?", we recount the following points:

1. Perfection does not seem to be implied in incarnation, for man having a spark of divinity incarnate is certainly not perfect. We are quite logically assured, too, that man does not come into the world without this spark of divinity. To deny this is not so much a discredit to man as to God.

2. The old idea of predestination determining every act and thought and word and deed of every man is found upon examination not to be a forceful doctrine, but a very feeble one, for man does not feel his choices to be affected by predestination, whereas it is quite logical to feel these choices determined by human free will. Predestination, then, other than toward perfection, is not even suitable to the divine guide nor to the man with the spark of divinity incarnate.

3. Even this predestination toward perfection is found wanting in the light of human free will and in the light of the human courses all around us which are obviously not on the road toward perfection.

Thus, we feel moved to decide in the negative on the sub-head, Is predestination implied in the incarnation?

Our third sub-head under the question, Can the incarnation and free will be reconciled?, reads: Was Jesus-Christ predestined to his course or did he blaze it?

Tolson has already been quoted to say "All men are divine because more or less conscious of their relation to God, but Jesus was controlled by this consciousness." And Buckham has expressed this thought in a former quotation, "If the best that is in us all is divine, He in whom the best rules absolutely is divine indeed." These two phrases, "controlled by this consciousness" and "in whom the best rules absolutely" imply that Jesus was motivated in a stronger way by the divine than other men are motivated. Was this motivation so strong and so complete as to be predestination? Or did this motivation in Jesus-Christ cause him to blaze his unusual course? Was there so much of God in Jesus-Christ that he could do no other than follow a perfect course? Or was there enough of the human in Jesus-Christ to make it necessary for him to make choices by human free will, and thus blaze for himself rather than follow by predestination his course on earth?

Are we to think of Jesus-Christ as having his life all "blue-printed" for him from the manger to the resurrection? Was a narrow pathway enclosed by two high walls to force his steps along his course? Was this the Puppet of God or the Son of God? Is there any virtue in the creation of a perfect robot? Because he was the incarnation of divinity, does that mean he had no choices, no free will? Was it predestined

that he could not make a mistake?

If the answer to all these questions is in the affirmative, there is very little incentive to try and follow such footsteps. We are not inclined to believe that our course is "blue-printed" for us. No high walls keep our steps on the straight, narrow path. Predestination is not preventing our mistakes.

A consideration of this question, Was Jesus-Christ predestined to his course, or did he blaze it?, may be handled in the following three divisions:

1. The effect of this predestination upon our attitude toward God.

2. The effect of this predestination upon our estimate of Jesus.

3. The effect of this predestination upon our aspirations to follow Jesus.

The first division, the effect of this predestination upon our attitude toward God.

If it could be proved to our rational satisfaction that Jesus-Christ was predestined by God to the course of earthly life we know, how would that affect our attitude toward God?

By predetermining the way Jesus-Christ was to go God would become a faultless machinist, the creator of a perfect robot. The workmanship must be admired and the result of the mechanical faultlessness must be appreciated. But what do humans think of a workman who presents a great creation for everyone to look upon that they may praise the author

of the creation? They may stand back from his in awe, but they are not so likely to be moved to stand close to him in love.

If God sent the spirit of divinity into the world incarnate in Jesus-Christ with the course mapped out, then He must have been a smugly complacent spectator of a drama with all the action going along just as He had ordained it should go. There need be no anxiety , no sympathy, no inspiration, no divine satisfaction in seeing a choice made in the right way, for all was predestined. This smug onlooker would not be the Deity to capture the love and loyalty of men who are struggling and striving in the very places where the perfect robot went along in the fore-ordained way.

The exhibit to mankind of perfection thus unearned and undeserved and only arbitrarily bestowed, must lower the respect of men for such a God, for even intuitive human justice is above that.

If the course was blazed, however, men look upon a Father with a Son, a Father who is sharing the struggles and efforts of the Son. Men feel a sympathetic response to such a Deity. He does not have so much the attitude of the self-satisfied observer, but rather the attitude of a keenly empathetic parent. Such a God would seem reasonably to appeal to mankind.

If it could be proved to our rational satisfaction that Jesus-Christ was predestined by God to the course of earthly life we know, it seems logical to conclude that the

love and respect of men toward such a God would very probably be lowered.

On the other hand, if it is proved to our rational satisfaction that Jesus-Christ blazed the course of earthly life we know, the God who is his Father shares with him and with us the sympathies and understanding of an interested participant in the drama of this earthly course.

The second division, the effect of this predestination on our estimate of Jesus.

One who follows a course which is inescapable hardly deserves a high rating from men who follow courses which are not inescapable. It took will power for Paul, Moses, and Stephen to live as they did, for they did not express themselves as feeling predestined. If Jesus couldn't have lived any other way than he did live, what credit does he deserve? Though he lived a better life than these others, they earned their places among men and he couldn't have done other than he did if he was predestined.

What becomes of "Thy will be done" as it was prayed in Gethsemane? These words have a hollow and meaningless sound if they were placed upon the lips of him who said them. Their meaning is very impressive if wrung from the heart of the one who said them.

Bushnell says that "He realized what are, humanly speaking, impossibilities; for his soul was warped and weakened by no human infirmities, doing all in a way of ease and naturalness, just because it is easy for clear waters to flow from a pure spring." [37]

If he was "weakened by no human infirmities, doing all in a way of ease and naturalness", why should he be honored and followed? If he was not assailed by human weakness and temptation, if it was easy for him to do what to us are, "humanly speaking, impossibilities", what good purpose does he serve as an inspiration to human men and women?

Anson Phelps Stokes, in contrast to Bushnell, states: "In him we see man raised by his Maker to divine heights. Men are created and limited, and Jesus Christ did not consider himself an exception to this rule. God is uncreated and unlimited.....God is trying to incarnate himself in every one of us, and it is to be hoped that some day we may all realize our latent divinity as did Jesus of Nazareth, and be in a measure Christs--perfect men in love faith." [38]

Here is a Jesus-Christ to serve adequately for inspirational guidance to men and women. Here is one who was limited with humanity and yet realized latent divinity. Those of us who are limited by humanity may realize latent divinity also. For such an example we can find practical use in religion.

If Jesus-Christ was predestined to his course, he loses favor in our sight. The power and the glory are things he couldn't help, not things he earned.

If Jesus-Christ blazed his course, he gains favor in our sight. For, though "limited", he realized in his life the supreme fact in history, the incarnation, and lived the

sinless life.

The third division, the effect of this predestination upon our aspirations to follow Jesus.

It seems rather axiomatic that no one can follow a predestined course of perfection who is not likewise predestined for that course of perfection. If a man believes, then, in the predestination of Jesus-Christ to perfection, to follow that same way, he must likewise be predestined to perfection. And what man, in his right mind, has ever claimed himself to be predestined to perfection?

The following of a blazed trail is a very different matter. The way has been pioneered. There is a course open to any disciple or follower who has the desire, the will power, and the spirit of surrender to Deity. When a trail is blazed, the purpose of its blazer is to point a way for those who desire to follow.

We have to give up in despair if his course was predestined; there is no hope for us. But we may take heart in hope if his course was blazed. If he was subjected to struggle and temptation, "in all points tempted like as we are", we feel closer to him and readier to follow him. Buckham gives us reassurance here: "To be above temptation and struggle Christ must have been, not sinless, but unsinable, not perfect but super-perfect. It would be nearer the truth to regard him as the most severely tempted of men." [39]

McCown strengthens us against predestination when he warns against thinking of Jesus as "A meek and mild ascetic

and mystic who walked through a troubled life to death on the cross like an automaton moved by the springs of Old Testament prophecy." [40]

I believe that accompanying the incarnation of divinity in Jesus-Christ was human free will. The spirit of divinity guided the choices of free will, but the inherent weakness of humanity made the following of these guided choices difficult. Therefore, though the incarnation implies guidance, it does not guarantee a following along the guided way.

Jesus-Christ realized the incarnation of divinity as no other human has ever done. He experienced the manifold temptations and fluctuations of human free will playing upon him as no other has ever done. In him the incarnation and free will meet and make the God-Man.

Thus we answer the main question forming the second division of the thesis, Can the incarnation and free will be reconciled?, in the affirmative after treating the three sub-heads under it:

1. Can we think of divinity without the incarnation?
2. Is predestination implied in the incarnation?
3. Was Jesus-Christ predestined to his course or did he blaze it?

We decided that it was not possible to think of divinity without incarnation, that predestination is not implied in incarnation, and that Jesus-Christ was not predestined to his course, but rather that he blazed it. He reconciles the incarnation and human free will in himself.

NOTES

1. Horace Bushnell, "The Character of Jesus, Forbidding His Possible Classification With Men" page 64

2. George T. Tolson, "The Renaissance of Jesus" page 19

3. S. Parkes Cadman, "The Christ of God" page 18

4. Ibid page 35

5. Ibid page 36

6. O.W.S. McCall, "Cardinals of Faith" page 67

7. George A. Gordon, "The Christ of Today" page 313

8. George T. Tolson, "The Renaissance of Jesus" page 208

9. W.S. Bruce, "Apologetics of Christianity Defensively Stated" Book III Chapter V pages 404-5

10. Leo N. Tolstoi, "My Religion" page 145

11. John Wright Buckham, "Christ and the Eternal Order" page 28

12. O.W.S. McCall, "Cardinals of Faith" page 13

13. Alfred W. Martin, "Great Religious Teachers" Chapter II pages 37-71

14. Ibid Chapter III pages 75-102

15. Ibid Chapter VII pages 227-265

16. Ibid Chapter VI pages 193-224

17. Anson Phelps Stokes, "What Jesus Christ Thought of Himself" pages 78-79

18. Ibid page 50

19. Ibid page 50

20. Alfred W. Martin, "Great Religious Teachers" Chapter I pages 14-20

21. Ibid Chapter I pages 20-33

22. Otto Pfleiderer, "The Early Christian Conception of Christ" page 29

23 Ibid page 30

24 Ibid page 31

25 Ibid pages 32-33

26 Ibid page 33

27 Ibid page 34

28 Ibid pages 35-45

29 Matthew 16:11-17

30 Matthew 14:33, John 1:34, Mark 14:61-62

31 Otto Pfleiderer, "The Early Christian Conception of Christ" page 169

32 O.W.S. McCall, "Cardinals of Faith" pages 82-83

33 George T. Tolson, "The Renaissance of Jesus" pages 125-6

34 George A. Gordon, "Through Man to God"

35 Leo N. Tolstoi, "My Religion" page 145

36 John Wright Buckham, "Christ and the Eternal Order" page 60

37 Horace Bushnell, "The Character of Jesus, Forbidding His Possible Classification with Men" page 68

38 Anson Phelps Stokes, "What Jesus Christ Thought of Himself" page 109

39 John Wright Buckham, "Christ and the Eternal Order" page 62

40 Chester Charlton McCown, "The Genesis of the Social Gospel"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Horace Bushnell "The Character of Jesus, Forbidding His Possible Classification with Men" The Pilgrim Press 1860 N.Y.

George A. Gordon "The Christ of Today" The Riverside Press 1896 Cambridge, Mass.

John Wright Buckham "Christ and the Eternal Order" The Pilgrim Press 1906

George T. Tolson "The Renaissance of Jesus" The Abingdon Press 1929

Otto Pfleiderer "The Early Christian Conception of Christ" G.P. Putnam's Sons 1905 New York

O.W.S. McCall "Cardinals of Faith" The Abingdon Press 1924

Sir James Marchant "Anthology of Jesus" Harper and Bros 1926 New York

Anson Phelps Stokes "What Jesus Christ thought of Himself" MacMillan Co. 1916 New York

Alfred W. Martin "Great Religious Teachers of the East" MacMillan Co. 1911 New York

Annie Besant "Four Great Religions" Theosophical Press 1897 Chicago

S. Parkes Cadman "The Christ of God" 1929

James Moffat "Everyman's Life of Jesus"
Doran Publishing Co. 1925 New York

Francis J. McConnell "The Christlike God"
1927

Paul Elmer More "Christ the Word"
Princeton Press 1927

J. Middleton Murray "Jesus, the Man of Genius"
1926

Chester Charlton McCown "Genesis of the Social Gospel"
Knopf Publishing C. 1929 New York

Hibbert Journal Supplement of 1909 "Jesus or Christ?"

Paul Arthur Schilpp "Do We Need a New Religion?"
Holt & Co. 1929 New York

S.D. M'Connell "Christ"
MacMillan 1904 New York

Edward Scribner Ames "The Divinity of Christ"
Bethany Press 1911 Chicago-N.Y.

Edward S. Drown "The Creative Christ
MacMillan 1922 New York

H.R. MacIntosh Scribners 1912 New York

James Moffat "Everyman's Life of Jesus"
Doran Publishing Co. 1929 New York

Francis J. McConnell "The Christlike God"
1927

Paul Elmer More "Christ the Word"
Princeton Press 1927

J. Middleton Murray "Jesus, the Man of Genius"
1926

Chester Charlton McCown "Genesis of the Social Gospel"
Harper Publishing Co. 1929 New York

Hibbert Journal Supplement of 1909 "Jesus or Christ?"

Paul Arthur Schilpp "Do We Need a New Religion?"
Holt & Co. 1929 New York

S.D. McConnell "Christ"
MacMillan 1904 New York

Edward Scribner Ames "The Divinity of Christ"
Bethany Press 1911 Chicago-N.Y.

Edward S. Drown "The Creative Christ
MacMillan 1922 New York

H.R. Mackintosh Scribners 1912 New York

End of

Predestination and incarnation

This title was preceded by

The Jesus of history reinterpreted for today

A critical evaluation of the contributions of Professor Benjamin W. Bacon to the interpretation of the fourth gospel

And is continued by

The social and religious origins of the Negro Church

The contribution of the new physics to religious thought